

of Jackson and State of Ohio, in place of Mark Sternberger. Incumbent's commission expires July 4, 1902.

William F. Hains, to be postmaster at Wilmington, in the county of Clinton and State of Ohio, in place of John C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

Ralph N. Warner, jr., to be postmaster at Haverford, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James E. Dougherty. Incumbent's commission expired August 16, 1898.

Jesse H. Roberts, to be postmaster at Downingtown, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Jesse H. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1902.

Abram M. Morrison, to be postmaster at Ennis, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas, in place of Abram M. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1902.

Carrie E. Hoke, to be postmaster at Taylor, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas, in place of Carrie E. Hoke. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1902.

Frederick G. Ellison, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont, in place of Frederick G. Ellison. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1902.

Ida A. Hewes, to be postmaster at Casper, in the county of Natrona and State of Wyoming, in place of Ida A. Hewes. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1902.

Maud Olmsted, to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

William E. Osmun, to be postmaster at Montague, in the county of Muskegon and State of Michigan. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Eugene E. Robertson, to be postmaster at Collins, in the county of Covington and State of Mississippi. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

George W. Young, to be postmaster at Brevard, in the county of Transylvania and State of North Carolina. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Joshua P. Jessup, to be postmaster at Hertford, in the county of Perquimans and State of North Carolina. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Lucian T. Claybaugh, to be postmaster at Donora, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Charles W. Anderson, to be postmaster at Platte, in the county of Charles Mix and State of South Dakota. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Charles H. Kuester, to be postmaster at North Judson, in the county of Starke and State of Indiana. Office becomes Presidential July 1, 1902.

Paul A. F. Walter, to be postmaster at Santa Fe, in the county of Santa Fe and Territory of New Mexico, in place of Simon Nussbaum. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1902.

William J. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Linton, in the county of Greene and State of Indiana, in place of Walter W. Wills, removed.

J. Watts Kearny, to be postmaster at New Orleans, in the parish of Orleans and State of Louisiana, in place of David G. Baldwin, resigned.

Stephen Farmer, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Weakley and State of Tennessee, in place of Henry C. Neely, removed.

Nellie M. Thiriot, to be postmaster at Park City, in the county of Summit and State of Utah, in place of Nellie M. Theriott, to correct name.

Thomas H. Davis, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Weber and State of Utah, in place of Charles Meighan, removed.

L. C. Schultz, to be postmaster at Green River, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming, in place of Karl Spinner, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25, 1902.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Maj. Frank F. Eastman, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be commissary with the rank of major, with rank from April 1, 1901.

Maj. Robert L. Bullard, commissary, to be major of infantry, with rank from April 1, 1901.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Ludde, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Burlington, in the State of Iowa.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Christopher D. Jones, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Beaufort, in the State of North Carolina.

POSTMASTERS.

John T. Davenport, to be postmaster at Gordonsville, in the county of Orange and State of Virginia.

Dalton A. Brosius, to be postmaster at Vermilion, in the county of Clay and State of South Dakota.

Emmons R. Stockwell, to be postmaster at Theresa, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

William H. Norris, to be postmaster at Carlyle, in the county of Clinton and State of Illinois.

Berry E. Raulerson, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Columbia and State of Florida.

A. L. Williams, to be postmaster at Edinburg, in the county of Christian and State of Illinois.

Champ T. Barksdale, to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Pittsylvania and State of Virginia.

Clarence E. Holt, to be postmaster at Hospital, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois.

Charles F. Best, to be postmaster at Nokomis, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois.

William P. Slack, to be postmaster at Carbondale, in the county of Jackson and State of Illinois.

Archibald Shaw, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana.

Samuel S. Dingle, to be postmaster at Wilmette, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Everett W. Osgood, to be postmaster at Winnetka, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Henry B. Van Nest, to be postmaster at Peabody, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas.

Clarkson L. Hutchens, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

James S. Reeves, to be postmaster at Union City, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

Frank H. Latta, to be postmaster at Battle Creek, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan.

Marshall M. Murdock, to be postmaster at Wichita, in the county of Sedgwick and State of Kansas.

Jesse D. Kennard, to be postmaster at Seneca, in the county of Nemaha and State of Kansas.

Fred H. Ackerman, to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

John A. Spalding, to be postmaster at Nashua, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

David E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Belding, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan.

Stephen G. Newman, to be postmaster at Haverstraw, in the county of Rockland and State of New York.

Emiel Rebell, to be postmaster at Fort Plain, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

L. E. Kittrell, to be postmaster at Socorro, in the county of Socorro and Territory of New Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 25, 1902.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-living God, our Father, look down we beseech Thee with compassion upon our infirmities, and forgive our sins. Deliver us from all sinister motives, and from the evil which doth so easily beset us. Help us to live to the high-water mark of Christian manhood seven days in the week. Be with all who are in distress or sorrow, all who are suffering, and comfort them.

Hear us especially when we pray for the King of England. If it is in accordance with Thy will, grant that he may be restored to strength to guide and control his nation in justice and equity under Thy direction; in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. HULL rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman from Illinois thinks that his bill should come in first, I am perfectly willing.

Mr. CANNON. I think that in five minutes we can dispose of it. I call up the conference report on the sundry civil bill and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up the conference report on the sundry civil bill and asks unanimous consent

to waive the reading of the report, and that the statement only be read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement was read.

[For text of the statement and conference report see page 7336.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a single word. The Senate amendments to this bill aggregated six and one-half million dollars in round numbers, \$2,700,000 of which was for the rebate on the tobacco tax. That was agreed to. After that was agreed to the remaining amendments were divided about half and half.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What amount is now carried by the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Sixty million dollars in round numbers.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. How does this amount compare with the sundry civil bill in the last Congress? I do not carry it in my mind.

Mr. CANNON. This is something less than in the last Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Can the gentleman state how much less?

Mr. CANNON. About \$1,000,000, as I now recollect it.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12804) making appropriations for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read, and not the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement only be read and the reading of the report be omitted. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement was read.

[For conference report and statement, see House proceedings of June 23.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, this report virtually, if adopted, closes up all matters of difference between the two Houses except on amendments 14 and 15. I will bring that up after the adoption of the report, if it should be adopted, and I ask a vote on the adoption of the report.

Mr. HAY. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa in the reading of the statement I did not hear the amendment proposed by the Senate with reference to men in the Army who stood examinations for commission. I did not hear it read as to what the result was.

Mr. HULL. The Senate recedes.

Mr. HAY. That is what I know, but I did not hear it read.

Mr. HULL. That is amendment numbered 4. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of the report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Speaker, amendments numbered 14 and 15 have not yet been agreed to. Amendment numbered 14 is where the Senate struck out "three" and inserted "four," making the appropriation for barracks and quarters \$4,000,000.

Mr. HAY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes; for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAY. I desire to know whether the gentleman from Iowa can call up something which is not in the conference report, except by the consent of the House?

Mr. HULL. If it disposes of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I should imagine I had the right to present anything that will pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia that the conference report is agreed to, and all that was submitted to the House for approval has been disposed of. This is as to those matters which are not yet disposed of, and therefore it is proper for the gentleman to bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. HAY. If the Speaker will permit me, these matters were taken out of the conference by order of the House.

The SPEAKER. And therefore must be met by the House in order to dispose of them.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, No. 14 simply increases the appropriation for barracks and quarters, without any change in the law, or any change in the language of the appropriation, from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000. Amendment numbered 15 made a reappropriation of \$350,000, and in addition to that changed the language under which the appropriations could be

used. The House took occasion to contest and to strike out all that relating to the reappropriation, and also as to the change of language, and adopted a part of the amendment of the Senate, and in conference the Senate conferees declined to take any action whatever on amendment 15.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear what the gentleman says unless he speaks louder.

Mr. HULL. Some gentlemen say that it is not in conference. It was not in conference in shape that the House conferees could consider any more suggestions looking to the modifying of these two amendments; but, Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it would not be in conference to the extent that if the Senate had receded from its disagreement to the action of the House we could have brought in a full report taking the entire matter out of controversy, and by the adoption of the report would have passed the bill. So that to this extent it was in conference. It was in conference to the extent that we could discuss it, that we could lay the matter before the conferees, that we could come to some arrangement, or we could reach an agreement that the Senate would agree to the action of the House; so that when gentlemen say that it was not in conference they do not state the whole truth. The conferees in full—

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, I still think that formally, technically, the two amendments were not in conference. The only way that the Senate could have disposed of them, or they could have been disposed of up to this time, would have been for the Senate to have receded from its amendment on 14 and to have agreed to the House amendment on 15. But let that be as it may, if the gentleman has any information, now that it is up to the House again, has any information or suggestion to make as to how this matter can be accommodated, it seems that the House is entitled to know it by a motion or suggestion.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that we could have made a full agreement, not only on what we have brought in, but on these two amendments by the Senate receding from its action, is evident that it was before us to that extent. But, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the conferees I agreed to test the sense of the House on a motion which I shall offer.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of order. There is absolutely nothing before the House.

Mr. HULL. I will make the motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I confess there is some novelty in the matter.

Mr. HULL. It is a very ordinary procedure, and the gentleman from Tennessee is guilty as often as any man on the floor of this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not catch the remark of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL. I say this is an ordinary procedure—to make an explanation before making the motion—something that happens every day, and the gentleman from Tennessee has been guilty of doing it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if the gentleman from Tennessee insists upon his point of order the Chair will be obliged to sustain it.

Mr. HULL. I recognize the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I will move that the House recede from its adherence to amendment 14 and agree to the Senate amendment by striking out the word "four" and inserting "three million three hundred and fifty thousand;" so that it will read: "three million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars." Now, Mr. Speaker, after the motion is stated I desire to give an explanation of that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House recede from its adherence to the disagreement to amendment 14 and agree to the same with the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "four million" and insert "three million three hundred and fifty thousand."

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the Senate conferees in the discussion of these points at issue between the two Houses are willing to recede from all legislation, leaving—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point of order, in order that the question may be presented fairly, that the House, having adhered to this proposition, can not now retreat. It is too late. The House has adhered to the disagreement to the amendment by a solemn vote, which is the highest action the House can take; and having adhered, it is not in order for the House to now retreat.

Mr. HULL. I am willing to submit that to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. While an adherence is the highest expression the House can give in respect to an amendment, still it is never beyond the

power of the House to recede from adherence, and there are abundant authorities where this has been done.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue after the Chair has ruled; but what is the distinction between a mere insistence and adherence?

The SPEAKER. That is a question of parliamentary law; but the Chair will state that it is to indicate to the other House how strongly it disagrees, but it never passes beyond the power of the House to recede from its adherence if it so desires.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the only question between the two Houses is on one proposition. The Senate conferees express themselves ready to agree to our amendment No. 15 providing we give this increase on the appropriation. They have already receded from other points of the bill more than making up this amount. This is the only point where there was an issue involved that they are insisting that they are right, and that they must have that amount in order to reach a final agreement on the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the chairman a question. I believe we gave two millions in the sundry civil bill and three millions in the Army bill and two millions in the Philippine proposition, which makes seven millions for buildings. Now, I want to ask if it did not develop in the conference that \$350,000 is merely to sustain their dignity, and did it not develop that there was no necessity for it?

Mr. HULL. No, it did not. I will say that the Secretary of War and the Adjutant-General insisted that on account of the large number of troops returning from the Philippines in excess of the number that it was assumed would be brought home when the estimate was submitted, that they needed all that the Senate gave in order to provide for these troops. Not only that, but with this amount they would perhaps have to put some of the troops in tents during the coming winter, and they wanted to push ahead the construction of barracks and quarters. It also developed in the conference, if I am permitted to refer to that, a Senator representing the gentleman's own party said that as far as he was concerned he had been with the contention of the House up to that point, but if we did not concede the \$350,000, so far as his opinion was concerned, so far as his efforts were concerned, so far as his advocacy was concerned, the bill might die; he would not surrender everything for nothing.

Now, I am not here to say whether it will die or not if we refuse to recede, but I do say that in the closing days of the session for this House to refuse this one concession, this one little amendment, and send it back without further adherence, is taking a course that it seems to me we ought not to take. There is nothing involved in the controversy which would justify such action by the House. So far as the War Department is concerned, if we are to build what the Secretary of War says, every dollar of money will be needed for temporary quarters until permanent barracks can be erected in their place.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One other question. How could the Senate let down from \$1,000,000 to \$350,000? If the \$1,000,000 was necessary, why did it not contend for it?

Mr. HULL. They did contend for it until we told them there was no use to discuss it, and, Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference, I think, went over this ground as thoroughly as they could, and I can say to the House that, according to the report of the Senate conferees, if we adopt this amendment I have proposed and insist on our amendment to No. 15, it will go to the Senate and be adopted and the bill will become a law. It was not giving half and half, as is the rule in so many conferences. It was absorbing nearly everything in the way of appropriations contended for by the House, and everything contended for by the House in the way of legislation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman not think the \$3,000,000 is ample?

Mr. HULL. No; I do not, after talking with the Secretary of War. I did think so until then, but I do not now.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. HULL. We are reducing the force in the Philippines and bringing them home to the extent of at least 15,000 more men than was anticipated four months ago we could do at this time. This is for taking care of them in the United States. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HAY. I would like to have about fifteen minutes.

Mr. HULL. I would be glad if the gentleman can get through with ten.

Mr. HAY. I think I can.

Mr. HULL. I will be satisfied with that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if he is going to say anything about this business.

Mr. HULL. Yes; I am going to yield some time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will yield to me just a mo-

ment or two now, I will say what I think about it, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HAY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. HULL. Then I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House recollects the commencement of this contention. The instruction of the House ran against the legislation proposed in these amendments. Now, then, the legislation is entirely eliminated from the first amendment. The second amendment does not abound in legislation. It merely fixes the amount to be appropriated. The original estimate was \$3,000,000. If this motion prevail, then we will send it to the Senate with an increase of \$350,000, making \$3,350,000 instead of \$4,000,000, which is an increase of \$350,000. As to the next amendment, the House amendment which we adopted the other day to 14, as to which I presume the gentleman will move that the House further insist upon its amendment that eliminates the \$350,000 appropriation in the last amendment, namely, 15, and eliminates the legislation. Thus is accomplished the contention of the House when it instructed its conferees not to assent to any legislation in connection with these three amendments. It leaves the Senate assenting to the position of the House and the House in every respect vindicating its opinion when the instructions were adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If that is true, I would ask the gentleman why he instructed the conferees in the first place so emphatically not to agree to the \$350,000 which he now concedes?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, they were not so instructed at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Why, the conferees were instructed—

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, he is in error. Our conferees were instructed not to agree to any provisions that changed existing law. They were not instructed at all as to the amounts carried in any of the amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Not at all; but the instruction given our conferees was to adhere, which took these amendments out of the conference, not only as to the legislation, but as to the amount.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but it said as to 13, 14, and 15 we adhered—the conferees could not consider them.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Why, of course.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, I am speaking of the instructions that were given in the first instance. They were aimed at the legislation in these amendments. They were in no way aimed nor did they cover the amount of money carried by these amendments. They were against the legislation originating in the Senate. Now, then, that covers the whole contention upon the part of the House. The other day the House did adhere to two of these amendments, but amended the other amendments. The Senate receded from one of the three and the other two are yet undisposed of; but the gentleman now states a situation by which it is patent to the House that its contention against legislation upon this bill is complied with by the Senate and by the House and at the same time the appropriation is decreased \$1,000,000.

Mr. HULL. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I only want a moment in which to say that this is a square and complete back down on the part of the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the House itself, if the motion prevails, from its position first taken in this matter. We may disguise it as we will, but by our former action we took these three amendments 13, 14, and 15, out of the conference, and the House of Representatives, under the leadership of my friend from Illinois, followed unanimously by this side of the House, said to these conferees by way of instructions: "You shall not consider these amendments, 13, 14, and 15. We adhere to those amendments, and if the Senate will not consent to give them up the bill shall fail."

Now, that is the position. It is no use at this time to go through all the different forms of legislation that have been pursued—first, the Senate ignoring our request for a conference, the House ignoring the request for a conference from the Senate, etc. We come at last to the point that the proposition was squarely met; that the Senate is to have its way substantially as to amendments 14 and 15, although not entirely, but it does give up amendment 13.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives said it would not consent to that. Now, it is proposed to abandon that position and

to consent. So far as I am concerned, I am not ready to do it. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me to read the instructions, this is what they were—

Mr. HULL. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] has the floor unless he yields.

Mr. HAY. I want to make my statement and then I will yield.

Mr. CANNON. It ought to come in right here.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman wants this to come in here so he can answer, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois, and not take the time out of the time of the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. CANNON. I only want a minute.

Mr. HULL. I yield two minutes, if the gentleman wants it, simply to read the instructions.

Mr. CANNON. This was the instruction on the part of the House. I hope the House will give me its attention:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 12804 are instructed—

Now listen—

not to recommend an agreement to said amendments numbered 13, 14, and 15 or to any modification thereof that will, under authority of said Army appropriation act, permit the expenditure of any sum for the construction of permanent buildings at established military posts except as authorized by section 1136 of the Revised Statutes.

There is the instruction; it speaks for itself, and the proposed arrangement by the gentleman from Iowa absolutely complies with it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, when this question first came before the House I did not think it was right that the House conferees should be instructed in advance, and I voted with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. The ground upon which the gentleman from Illinois put these instructions, or one of them, taken up and followed out by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], was that the Senate was increasing beyond what was necessary the appropriation for barracks. Now, the Secretary of War made the estimate upon the idea of an army of 87,000 men, for \$3,000,000 for barracks and quarters, not for the Philippines, but for this country.

That estimate was incorporated into the Army appropriation bill in the House. When it went to the Senate, without any further estimate being sent by the Secretary of War, without any official communication whatsoever from the War Department, that appropriation was increased by \$4,000,000, and when it came back here the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] dwelt particularly upon this increase. He talked about the duplication of appropriations and about the large amount that the Senate was putting upon this bill, and members upon this side voted with him, not because they were fearful of taking from him the jurisdiction of which he was so jealous, but because they thought they were preventing a large appropriation from getting upon this bill when it was not necessary for it to be there.

Now, the various appropriations which have been made for barracks and quarters amount to \$7,000,000, all that the Department has asked for—\$2,000,000 in the Philippines, \$2,000,000 in the sundry civil bill, and \$3,000,000 for these barracks and quarters, of which not more than \$20,000 can be expended upon any one of them. Now, we are asked to add \$350,000 to this appropriation. Why? Not because it is needed, not because the War Department can not get along without it, but because we must do something to heal the wounded feelings of the Senate of the United States. Now, that is the whole of it, and that is all of it. The gentleman from Iowa a moment ago said that Senator COCKRELL said that if we did not agree to this \$350,000, the bill could die, so far as he was concerned.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Is not that exactly what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] have said in respect to this amendment that they put on?

Mr. HAY. Unquestionably.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to the parliamentary rule that members of the other House can not be named in debate.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman from Iowa named him.

Mr. HULL. I did not.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman said the Democrat on the conference committee, which is the same thing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that when a member uses the name of a member of the other House the Chair will promptly call him to order. The Chair knows that the gentleman will be glad to comply with the rule.

Mr. HAY. If I have not complied with the rule I am sorry, but it is the same thing and it makes no difference. I say that the whole point of this amendment is to heal the wounded feelings of the Senate because this House saw fit to instruct us in

regard to this amendment. I never had any question of the right of the House to instruct its conferees.

I did not think it was courteous to the conferees, but it was not because it would hurt the feelings of the Senate that I had any scruples about it; because the House has that right, and has the right to exercise it at any time; and I say that gentlemen accepting this compromise, if they are willing to vote for the motion of the gentleman from Iowa are receding from what they did, and they are receding from what the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania said they never would recede from. If they want to do it, it is all right; but they ought to do that with the knowledge of the fact that it is done, not because we need the \$350,000 for these Army posts, but it is because we are doing something to heal the wounded feelings of the Senate. For one, I shall vote against the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, just one word in conclusion. There is no principle of surrender involved on the part of the House on a single question we have been instructed upon. There is no yielding on the part of the House on any principle that has been at issue between the Senate and the House. There is simply an increase of \$350,000, and that only in this one case of barracks or quarters. The Senate yields \$1,350,000 of its amendment, and my motion would make the House yield only \$350,000.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HULL. For a question only.

Mr. CLARK. I want to ask you a question. If you were right then, what was the sense of the gentleman from Illinois getting up that hullabaloo and having that extraordinary committee appointed?

Mr. HULL. That was simply a question raised by an instruction which changed the legislation, which he claimed then would make a duplication of accounts. This amendment, if my motion shall be adopted bringing the House to an agreement, does not lead to any duplication of accounts, because it secures the same line of demarcation in this bill as we have had heretofore, as the gentleman from Illinois stated in his remarks a few moments ago. Now, on the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia, that the estimates were only \$3,000,000. That is true. The estimates were made up last September. It was estimated that at that time at least 35,000 troops should be kept in the Philippine Islands.

Subsequent events have developed that we can bring a much larger number home, at least 12,000 more troops will be brought to this country in the next two or three months than it was formerly thought would be possible. They will have to be cared for at these posts. The only way to care for them is to provide enough for barracks and quarters to make them comfortable, and the gentleman objects. The Democratic party in this matter is simply following its uniform rule of opposing everything that would benefit the Army of the United States. I demand the previous question.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman is not correct in that statement.

Mr. HULL. I move the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We followed the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ask the gentleman if he will yield?

Mr. HULL. No; I do not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman has intentionally misrepresented this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend until he has consent.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman has intentionally misrepresented this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HULL. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then, I say we followed the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois in this opposition, and now the gentleman says that the Democratic side was opposing something for the benefit of the Army. He should read that lecture to the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for thirty seconds?

Mr. HULL. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois, and then I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is no chance for disagreement about this matter. I say that the contention of the House in the beginning by this arrangement is sustained. Now, then, touching the amount that is involved, I see no politics in it. I think we could get along very well without the \$350,000,

and still I am inclined to allow them the \$350,000 over the estimates on the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then I ask the gentleman, if there is no politics in it, why the gentleman from Iowa should have assailed the Democratic side for following your leadership?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman yielded by bowing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman should wait until request has been made.

Mr. HULL. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that I have ever in my whole service in this House been in any way opposed to taking care of the Army is absolutely untrue, and the statement that the Democratic party has done anything against the Army or has spoken against it or taken any steps which would reflect upon it, is a slander to which gentlemen on that side resort only that they may obtain some cheap capital in the coming Congressional campaign. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the same purpose as did the gentleman from Virginia. I deny that my action in the committee or in the House in connection with Army legislation has been controlled by politics. I think that when my friend who is chairman of the committee, who is usually both fair and courteous, ceases to be blinded by passion he will at least recall what he has just now said, and I appeal to him, as a fair and honest-minded man, to say if he believes that my action in connection with military legislation, in the committee or in the House, has ever been controlled by dishonest or unworthy motives. I deny his statement absolutely so far as it was applied to me. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I referred to the party and not individuals, and now I will refer gentlemen on the other side to the last speech made in this House by the late Hon. Amos J. Cummings. I now move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on receding from the adherence to the disagreement and agreeing to the amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAY) there were—130 ayes and 70 noes.

So the motion of Mr. HULL was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Our leader, Mr. CANNON, having abandoned us, we shall refuse to follow him any further. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment 15.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House further insist on its amendment to the amendment No. 15.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the several votes just taken was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the naval appropriation bill, and I ask that the reading of the report be omitted and that the statement only be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, asks unanimous consent that the reading of the report be omitted and that the statement only be read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the statement of the House conferees, as follows: The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14046) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report on each of the amendments of the Senate, viz:

On Nos. 2, 3, 53, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75: Changes name of naval cadets to that of midshipmen.

On No. 4: Authorizes the accounting officers of the Treasury, as proposed by the Senate, to allow in the settlement of the accounts of disbursing officers payments under the appropriation of emergency fund to civilian employees doing duty at naval stations in our insular possessions during the coming fiscal year and until such time as Congress shall make specific appropriation for the pay of such employees.

On No. 5: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the Senate, to pay all civilian employees in our insular possessions a per diem compensation corresponding to their pay while actually employed from the date of their sailing from the United States and while returning to the United States.

On No. 6: Strikes out the appropriation of \$13,975, as proposed by the Senate, for renting, heating, and lighting an additional building.

On No. 8: Directs the Secretary of the Navy, as proposed by the Senate, to appoint a board of naval officers to select a site for a naval training station on the Great Lakes and make report to Congress of its action, and to defray the expenses of said board appropriates \$5,000.

On No. 10: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,400 for a clerk at Cavite, P. I., as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 11: Reduces the total appropriation under the civil establishment of the Bureau of Ordnance by \$1,400, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 12: Inserts the provision enabling the Secretary of the Navy to purchase necessary land for coal depots, \$640,000, and authorizes the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow all expenditures heretofore made for land purchased for use as naval coal depots out of said appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, but strikes out the provision, as proposed by the Senate, for a reappropriation of unexpended balances made for the establishment of naval coal depots.

On No. 14: Appropriates \$200, as increase to the salary of one clerk at the navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H., as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 15: Corrects the total of paragraph by said amount.

On Nos. 16, 17, and 18: Changes the form of expression of two writers, as proposed by the Senate, but does not increase the appropriation.

On Nos. 19 and 20: Changes form of expression, as proposed by the Senate, but does not change the appropriation.

On No. 21: Inserts one clerk in charge of distribution of books, at \$1,200.

On No. 22: Changes the total of said paragraph to correspond with above increase.

On No. 23: Changes the total appropriation in the civil establishment, Bureau of Equipment, to conform to the above increase.

On No. 27: Appropriates \$90,000 for the completion of building No. 19, and \$1,500 for an extension to dispensary building in New York Navy-Yard.

On No. 28: Changes totals in appropriations for New York Navy-Yard in accordance with the above.

On No. 29: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion to condemn a certain tract of land, or so much thereof as may be necessary, adjacent to the Norfolk Navy-Yard, and to report such proceedings to the next session of Congress.

On No. 30: Appropriates \$25,850 to complete the purchase of land already condemned and partially appropriated for at Key West, Fla.

On No. 31: Changes the totals in appropriations for naval station at Key West, Fla.

On Nos. 32 and 33: Increases the appropriation from \$2,000 to \$4,000, or so much as may be necessary, as proposed by the Senate, for additional land at the navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington.

On No. 34: Changes the totals in appropriations for navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington, to conform to above.

On No. 35: Strikes out unnecessary language, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 36: Changes form of expression, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 41: Strikes out appropriation of \$150,000 for improving harbor at San Luis d'Apra, island of Guam, as proposed by Senate.

On No. 42: Inserts caption, "Plans and specifications for public works," as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 44: Strikes out appropriation of additional \$100,000 for naval hospital, Naval Academy, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 45: Inserts provision, as proposed by the Senate, permitting the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to continue improvements at the Naval Academy, either by contract or by day labor, or both, as he may deem necessary for the best interests of the Government.

On No. 48: Strikes out additional appropriation of \$5,000 for Naval Observatory, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 49: Strikes out appropriation of \$2,000 for expenses of board of visitors to the Naval Observatory, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 50: Authorizes an increase of 1,000 copies of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives and Navy Department, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 51: Authorizes appropriation of \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and improvements on buildings and construction of a contagious disease hospital at Mare Island, Cal.

On Nos. 54 and 55: Insert the word "each," as proposed by the Senate, a verbal omission.

On No. 58: Strikes out appropriation of \$3,800, as proposed by the Senate, for clerks at naval station, Cavite, P. I.

On No. 60: Strikes out increase in total appropriations, as proposed by the Senate, civil establishment, Bureau of Construction and Repair.

On No. 62: Inserts provision, as proposed by the Senate, allowing appropriation for incidental expenses to be applied to the Bureau.

On No. 63: Strikes out appropriation of \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingencies, drawing materials, and instruments for the drafting room of the Bureau of Steam Engineering.

On No. 65: Strikes out appropriation of \$1,200, as proposed by the Senate, for one writer at naval station, Cavite, P. I.

On No. 66: Strikes out the increase in total appropriations, as proposed by the Senate, for naval establishment, Bureau of Steam Engineering, to conform to the above.

On No. 67: Strikes out appropriation for \$1,000 for an assistant librarian at Naval Academy.

On No. 69: Strikes out increase in total appropriations, as proposed by the Senate, for Naval Academy to conform to above.

On No. 72: Inserts a provision, as proposed by the Senate, for extending the use of the appropriation of \$3,000 for clerk hire, carriages, and other incidental and necessary expenses of the Board of Visitors at Naval Academy.

On No. 78: Strikes out increase in totals of appropriations for Naval Academy, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 79: Restores sections 8, 9, and 10 of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

On No. 80: Inserts a provision that the present Commandant of the Marine Corps shall have the rank, pay, and allowance of a major-general in the Army, but this shall not extend to his successor or successors.

On No. 81: Increases the appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, for the pay of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps from \$1,112,548 to \$1,236,028.

On No. 82: Adds to the enlisted force of the Marine Corps now authorized by law, as proposed by the Senate, 10 gunnery-sergeants, 40 sergeants, 60 corporals, 10 drummers, 10 trumpeters, and 620 privates.

On No. 83: Increases the appropriation for "Provisions, Marine Corps," as proposed by the Senate, from \$386,071.50 to \$445,071.50.

On No. 84: Increases the appropriation for "Clothing of the Marine Corps" from \$40,000 to \$82,000.

On No. 85: Increases the appropriation for "Military stores," as proposed by the Senate, from \$40,297 to \$50,297.

On No. 86: Increases the appropriation for "Transportation and recruiting the Marine Corps," as proposed by the Senate, from \$100,000 to \$110,000.

On No. 87: Increases the appropriation for "Contingent, Marine Corps," as proposed by the Senate, from \$91,700 to \$103,700.

On No. 90: Inserts a provision, as proposed by the Senate:

"All contracts of the Carnegie Steel Company, Limited, heretofore made between it and the United States, shall be completed by its successor—the Carnegie Steel Company or its lawful successor—which has acquired and assumed, or may acquire and assume, all of its assets and all of its liabilities

under the said contracts. And the said Carnegie Steel Company, or its lawful successor, upon giving security in proper form and amount, conditioned for the performance by it of the said contracts according to the true intent and meaning thereof, shall be substituted therein for the said Carnegie Steel Company, Limited, and be entitled to exercise all rights thereunder which the said Carnegie Steel Company, Limited, had or would have had if it had continued in existence."

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the following amendments, viz:

On No. 1, relating to total appropriation for the pay of the Navy.
On Nos. 7 and 13, relating to the "Maintenance of colliers," as to whether this provision should be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Navigation or the Bureau of Equipment.

On No. 9, as to whether the unexpended balances remaining in the Treasury on June 30, 1902, from the appropriation for "Ordnance and ordnance stores, 1900, or so much thereof as may be necessary," should be reappropriated for expenditure in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made and properly chargeable to said appropriation.

On No. 24, as to the increase in the corps of civil engineers.
On Nos. 25 and 26, as to an appropriation of \$500 for making an examination concerning the furnishing water supply of Portsmouth Navy-Yard, and an appropriation of \$200,000 toward the removal of Hendersons Point, near said navy-yard.

On Nos. 37, 38, 39, and 40, as to appropriations to the amount of \$657,300 for naval station at Charleston, S. C.

On No. 43, as to total appropriations in all for public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

On No. 46, as to the appropriation of \$100,000 for the construction of a building for Bureau of Equipment at Pensacola Navy-Yard.

On No. 47, as to the total appropriation for public works, Bureau of Ordnance.

On No. 52, as to the increase in the corps of surgeons.

On No. 56, as to an appropriation of \$2,000 for one bookkeeper and one clerk at Pensacola Navy-Yard.

On No. 57, as to increase in total appropriations for civil establishment, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

On No. 58, as to the increase in the Pay Corps.

On No. 61, as to the increase in the corps of naval constructors.

On No. 64, as to an appropriation of \$200,000 toward the construction of an experimental station and testing laboratory in the department of marine engineering and naval construction at Annapolis.

On No. 76, as to an increase in the corps of midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

On No. 77, as to a provision authorizing all examinations for admission to the Naval Academy to be held at Annapolis.

On No. 88, as to an appropriation of \$1,500 for improvements at the marine barracks, navy-yard, Boston.

On No. 89, as to changes in the amount of total appropriations for public works, Marine Corps.

On No. 91, as to "Increase of the Navy" and the method of construction of new ships authorized, whether they shall be built by contract or some in Government navy-yards, or the whole subject be left within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

On No. 92, as to the provision requiring the Secretary of the Navy to contract for five more Holland torpedo boats at a cost of \$170,000 each, after the acceptance of one of said boats now being built for the Government.

On No. 93, as to a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to have tested any completed submarine boats or boats other than the *Holland* type, and purchase, in his discretion, one of the same, if found to be equal or superior to the best submarine torpedo boat then in use in the Navy, at a price not to exceed \$170,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate appropriated \$79,351,233.13, being an increase of \$1,731,205 over the amount carried as it was passed by the House. Of this sum, the committee of conference recommend that \$179,375 be stricken out and that \$371,130 be agreed to.

GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
ALSTON G. DAYTON,
ADOLPH MEYER.

Managers on the part of the House.

[For conference report, see page 7264.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would state that this report leaves in disagreement certain Senate amendments, particularly the increase in the different staff corps in the Navy; the question of the maintenance of colliers, whether that provision should be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Navigation or under the Bureau of Equipment; the question as to the construction of our ships, whether they should be built in the Government navy-yards or by private contract or by both, and also the further question as to the *Holland* submarine torpedo boats. These matters are in disagreement. Now I will move that the report be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY].

Mr. RIXEY. I notice the conferees have agreed on the amendments 80 and 82. Eighty is an amendment providing for the increase of the rank of Brigadier-General Heywood to that of major-general. No. 82 increases the Marine Corps. There were quite a number of amendments increasing other corps of the Navy, and I wanted to ask the gentleman if there was any reason why the conferees should have agreed to increasing the Marine Corps and not passing upon the other corps?

Mr. FOSS. If the gentleman will notice, the increase is in the number of privates, 620, and in the petty officers; not in higher officers of the corps, as was considered in the committee.

Mr. RIXEY. There is an increase in the rank of General Heywood?

Mr. FOSS. The Senate was very insistent on the increase in his rank, but that was not to apply to his successor. It was simply done as a reward to General Heywood, who had been in charge of the Marine Corps during the Spanish war, and at the same time is a soldier of the civil war.

Mr. RIXEY. I will state to my friend that I was under the

impression that the increase in all the corps was not to be consented to, but should be considered by the House Naval Committee and a special bill brought in for all the corps.

Mr. FOSS. That was the general understanding, as to the increase in the number of lieutenants, of captains, lieutenant-colonels, or colonels of course that would apply.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to agree to the conference report.

The question was taken and the report agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to these amendments which are in disagreement, I understand that my colleague upon the committee desires a vote upon 92, I think, and 93, with reference to the increase in the number of *Holland* torpedo boats. If there are no other votes demanded, I desire to make a motion.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think we had about as well dispose of the question of the increase of cadets at Annapolis. It seems to me that we can agree on something very near to the amendment of the Senate, unless he prefers to have that go back to conference. I will leave it, however, to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FOSS. I would suggest to the gentleman that we go back to conference on that provision.

Mr. RIXEY. Very well, Mr. Speaker; I shall not insist upon it.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to all amendments, except 92 and 93, referring to submarine boats, namely, Nos. 1, 7, 9, 13, 24, 25, 26, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 46, 47, 52, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 76, 77, 88, 89, and 91, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any other amendments than 92 and 93? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no such demand. Without objection, then, the vote will be put in gross. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House insist upon its disagreement to these amendments of the Senate.

The question was taken, and the motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments 92 and 93, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the amendments 92 and 93?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendments read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

(92) Additional submarine boats: That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and required to contract with the *Holland Torpedo Boat Company* for five of its most improved type of submarine torpedo boats, to be built under the plans and specifications of said company, at a cost not to exceed the price contracted to be paid for the *Holland* boats now being built for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That no contract shall be made with the said company until one of the *Holland* boats now being built for the Department shall have been accepted by the Secretary of the Navy.

(93) That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to have tested any completed submarine boat or boats, other than the *Holland* type, that may be presented to him for trial within six months after the passage of this act, and if he shall find by said tests that any of the said boats, if one or more than one is presented, shall be equal or superior to the best submarine torpedo boat which shall then be in use in the Navy, he is authorized, in his discretion, to purchase the best one of the said boats at a price not to exceed \$170,000.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves in respect to these two amendments that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the amendments.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, we desire separate votes upon these propositions, and I want to ask my colleague if he desires any time for discussion.

Mr. WHEELER. Do I understand that the gentleman from Illinois demands a separate vote?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, there are some members who desire to discuss this matter. How much time does the gentleman think will be proper?

Mr. FOSS. Inasmuch as the gentleman will take the affirmative of the proposition, I would ask him.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Well, the gentleman controls the time. I would say that I think we ought to have half an hour on a side. I understand the desire of members in charge of the Philippine bill to be to get along with that bill as quickly as possible. I have no desire to block them in their progress whatever, and I would think thirty minutes on a side would be ample. This matter has been very well ventilated in hearings before the committee, and I might say frankly to the gentleman that I believe the members of the House are very conversant with the subject. Unless he himself, having control of the time, desires to consume any of it in opposition to this amendment, we upon the affirmative have no desire to take up any of the time of the House in opposition to the progress of the Philippine measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Illinois to what his demand for a division applies, whether as to the motion of the gentleman or of the two sections?

Mr. FOSS. Of the two sections.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that I shall demand a division of the vote to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands a division, then, on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my colleague that, inasmuch as some gentlemen here desire to discuss the proposition, we take half an hour on a side and then come to a vote.

The SPEAKER. Under the demands made, the first question will be on receding from the House disagreement to amendment 92. Was any agreement reached as to time?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Half an hour on a side.

The SPEAKER. That will have to be referred to the House, unless that can be done within the hour.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. That can be done within the hour.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] yield half an hour to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask unanimous consent that we have debate on this proposition for one hour—thirty minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER] and thirty minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Objection was made.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois yield out of his hour to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FOSS. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has an hour on this motion.

Mr. FOSS. Then I yield to my colleague thirty minutes.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I yield fifteen minutes of the time allotted to me to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN].

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, these amendments of the Senate on which the gentleman from New Jersey has made this motion to recede and concur pertain to the submarine torpedo boats. It is a question for this House to decide whether we shall have more submarine torpedo boats than we now have, and if we are going to have them, whether we are going to authorize them by this bill. As for myself, I believe the submarine torpedo boat is an effective machine for the defense of our harbors. Before our committee two years ago Admiral Dewey spoke highly of the effectiveness of the torpedo boats, especially in regard to the moral effect the presence of a torpedo boat would have upon an enemy approaching a harbor. If there had been two torpedo boats in Manila Harbor and Admiral Dewey and his men had known of their presence there the American fleet would never have entered that harbor. No commander of a fleet will take his fleet into a harbor where he knows there are submarine torpedo boats, for the plain reason that he knows there would be a strong probability of his battle ships being blown up and hundreds of lives destroyed, and if that should occur that he would be written down in history as a reckless man, and would be censured by all the world for such a reckless and needless risk of human life.

Another thing: For the cost of one battle ship we can have enough submarine torpedo boats constructed, according to estimates furnished by a Navy Department official, to give each harbor on the Atlantic coast and each harbor on the Pacific coast two submarine torpedo boats. In other words, we could furnish ample and, I believe, complete protection to every harbor on the United States coast—the old United States, over which the Constitution is, I mean—by means of these torpedo boats. A battle ship costs six or seven million dollars. That amount of money will buy 60 or 70 of these torpedo boats at \$100,000 apiece, and we could distribute these among our harbors of the old United States and have ample protection against any hostile fleet that might wish to attack us.

But some one may say that these men who furnish the torpedo boats want to charge the United States an exorbitant price. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is a question of detail with which the Department may struggle under the provisions of these Senate amendments. Those who have invented these torpedo boats should have fair profit; but they should not be allowed to "gouge" the Government unduly. This amendment puts it in the power of the Secretary of the Navy to make contracts, and he should not permit a gouge to be made. We ought to get these boats at reasonable prices; and we can do so if this House is in favor of the proposition. Congress can authorize or limit the cost at a smaller sum than that in the Senate amendment. The question now is not as to the price particularly, but whether we shall have more torpedo boats as a means of defense. I favor reducing the price.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we all admit that the great strength of the Navy is its battle ships, its protected cruisers, and its ar-

mored cruisers. The submarine torpedo boat is not an offensive weapon in the first instance, but it is a very complete and very effective weapon of defense. Now, the question for this House to settle this morning is whether if you believe that the torpedo boat furnishes an effective defense for a harbor, and if you believe that you can protect every harbor in the United States by means of a torpedo boat at a cost not exceeding the cost of one great battle ship, then the question is whether it is not good judgment, whether it is not good business policy, to authorize the construction of more of these torpedo boats and thus have this cheap and effective defense to our harbors.

Down in my State the greatest seaport town in North Carolina has petitioned the Secretary of the Navy and indirectly this Congress to furnish torpedo boats for the defense of the harbor of Wilmington. There are those who object to submarine boats. A little torpedo boat, carrying only a very few men, offers no striking inducement for a naval officer to seek command of it. If you leave the matter to the naval officers, eliminating the question of price, they will say that we need great battle ships. But here is a question of utility and economy that appeals to my judgment. I believe that this country ought to have more of these submarine torpedo boats. Other nations have them. We ought not to allow our coast to remain undefended when we can defend it so effectively and cheaply by this means. The defense of our harbors by these submarines will obviate the necessity for so many boats costing vastly more money.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eight minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether a non-expert has a right to any opinion upon questions of this character; but as long as the Naval Committee of the Senate disagrees with the Naval Committee of the House, and as long as the members of the Naval Committee of the House themselves can not get together upon the proposition, it seems to me that probably some of us who know very little about it should have a right to express our opinion in regard to the matter.

I have on two occasions seen these boats perform. On one occasion I had the pleasure of taking a dive in one, and it seems to me that this boat has effectually solved the question of submarine navigation. It is a boat that can be controlled at will; that can rise and sink at pleasure; that can rise and fire a torpedo and sink again out of sight within less than ten seconds; a boat that, even when it rises for observation or to discharge a torpedo, exposes only a small portion of the turret as a target for the enemy's guns; and even in a smooth sea a moving target exposed only a few inches above the water and exposed for only a few seconds would be secure from harm, though fired upon by the best of gunners.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COWHERD. For a question.

Mr. STEELE. My friend says that he has been on board one of these boats. Now, I should like to ask him if one of them was about to go into action, in practical use, and was about to fire a torpedo into an opposing ship, would the gentleman want any of his friends to go down in one?

Mr. COWHERD. I will say this, that I had far rather go in one of these boats to attack a battle ship than to go in an ordinary torpedo boat, or a torpedo-boat destroyer, or in the battle ship itself. It seems to me that, as far as security is concerned, the man in the submarine torpedo boat has a very great advantage over the man in the ship that is on the surface of the water.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do you think that when they were in action you would want to go in any of them?

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, I am not looking for that kind of a job. Like my friend from Ohio, I would a good deal rather fire off discharges with my mouth than from a torpedo tube. Men of high rank in the Navy tell me that we must have every new invention adopted by any other nation on earth, and that we ought to have it among the first of the nations of the earth, not alone for the benefits that come from actual use, but the advantages of intimidation that comes from its possession; and so far the torpedo has been more effectual as a threat than a weapon. Now, the other nations are adopting these boats, and I believe we should keep pace with them. It is said that this invention is only satisfactory in defensive warfare, but I submit to this House that if our Navy had possessed one of these boats when it was lying outside of the harbor of Santiago for more than thirty days in the broiling sun, waiting for an opportunity to attack the Spanish fleet, we would only have needed to carry one of those boats there and send it into the harbor to have blown up all the ships of the Spanish navy without danger of loss on our own part.